

- 1 -

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

#12

In re Application: Axel Thomsen et al.

Serial No.: 09/695,706

Filed: October 25, 2000

Art Unit: 2816

Examiner: M. Ton

For: TECHNIQUES FOR SIGNAL MEASUREMENT USING A
CONDITIONALLY STABLE AMPLIFIER

RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT

Assistant Commissioner for Patents
Washington, D. C. 20231

Dear Sir:


In response to the Office Action having a mailing date of September 21, 2001 with a one-month shortened statutory period for response set to expire on October 22, 2001 (Paper No. 5), the Applicant hereby responds as follows:

The Examiner has required restriction to one of the following inventions:

- I. Claims 1-12 and 28-31 drawn to a signal processing integrated circuit, classified in class 327, subclass 69; and
- II. Claims 13-27 drawn to an instrumentation amplifier, classified in class 327, subclass 339.

CERTIFICATION UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.8

I hereby certify that this correspondence (along with any item referred to as being enclosed herewith) is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to the Assistant Commissioner for Patents, Washington, D.C. 20231, on October 19, 2001.


Signature

Gracie Segovia
(Printed name of person certifying)

The Applicants provisionally elect to continue prosecution of claims 1-12 and 28-31 of Group I with traverse. The restriction requirement is submitted to be improper for the reasons below.

The inventions are asserted to be related as subcombinations disclosed as usable together as a single combination. (Paper No. 5, page 2.) It is asserted that the inventions are distinct, each from the other, because the invention of Group I has separate utility as a chopper circuit. (Paper No. 5, page 2.)

The Applicants respectfully disagree that the aforementioned assertions demonstrate that the inventions are distinct. The invention of Group I include a chopper-stabilized feed-forward amplifier. A chopper-stabilized amplifier demodulates the converted input signal by effectively multiplying the modulated input signal by the chopping waveform. Thus, the Applicants respectfully disagree that the invention of Group I could be separately usable as a chopper.

For the aforesaid reasons, the Applicants respectfully assert that the restriction requirement is unsupported by a showing that the inventions in Groups I is distinct. *See* MPEP § 806.05(e). The Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the restriction requirement upon reconsideration.

Applicants respectfully requests that the Examiner call Applicants' attorney at the below listed number if the Examiner believes that such a discussion would be helpful in resolving any remaining problems.

Respectfully submitted,

WINSTEAD SECHREST & MINICK P.C.
Attorney for Applicant

By: Barry S. Newberger
Barry S. Newberger
Reg. No. 41,527

5400 Renaissance Tower
1201 Elm Street
Dallas, Texas 75270
(512) 370-2808